

Remarks

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. Claims 3-6 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, and 7-10 stand rejected. The Examiner objected to the considered claims because of various informalities and rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In addition, the Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,750,527 issued to Heinemann ("Heinemann") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,373,790 issued to Chemiere ("Chemiere").

By way of this Response, Applicant cancels claims 1-10 and adds new claims 11-30. New claims 11-30 are fully supported by the specification and do not raise or contain new matter. Applicant believes the application as amended places the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application as amended is respectfully requested

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The claims have been cancelled and rewritten as new claims 11-30 in order conform to standard U.S. practice. The claims have been rewritten to eliminate any informalities or grammatical inaccuracies and to conform to standard U.S. practice where the claims are in sentence form and proper format, as suggested by the Examiner. The Applicant believes the new claims, as rewritten, fulfill the requirements set forth in 35 U.S.C. § 112 and particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully request that the claim rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinemann in view of Chemiere. In light of the rewritten claims discussed below in Allowable Subject Matter, Applicants believe this rejection is moot, and respectfully request this rejection be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated that there was allowable subject matter, the limitations of which has been incorporated in the rewritten claims. In particular, independent claims 1 and 22 recite an aggressive substance at least partially contacts the surface of the initializing part so that the surface corrodes after a predetermined period of time, the initiating explosive substance therein mixing with the aggressive substance and neutralizing the initiating explosive substance thereby disabling initializing part/mine. Therefore, rewritten claims 1 and 22 are believed to be allowable, as are dependent claims 12-21 and 23-30, of which rewritten claims 11 and 22 respectively are the base claim.

Conclusion

Applicants have made a genuine effort to respond to each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in advancing the prosecution of this case. Applicants believe that all formal and substantive requirements for patentability have been met and that this case is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. If any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at his earliest convenience.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,
BORIS PERVAN

By /Erin K. Bowles/
Erin K. Bowles
Reg. No. 64,705
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: August 14, 2009

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351